



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,883	09/16/2003	Aleksey Sanin	AOL0073	8888
<div>7590 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 Edison Way Suite L Menlo Park, CA 94025</div>				
EXAMINER				
CAO, PHUONG THAO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2164				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/27/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,883

Applicant(s)

SANIN, ALEKSEY

Examiner

Phuong-Thao Cao

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19-23, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19-23, 25 and 26 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 07/23/2008.
2. Claims 1, 8, 14 and 21 have been amended and claims 5, 11, 18 and 24 were previously cancelled. Currently, claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19-23, 25 and 26 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 07/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument (see Remarks, page 9) that there is no teaching or suggest anywhere in Feuerstein et al. that a resource request is verified, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Obviously, the process of validating a request as disclosed in Feuerstein et al., [0011] and [0053] is a process of verifying the request as broadly recited.

Regarding Applicant's argument (see Remarks, page 11) that the combination of Call and Feuerstein et al. fails to teach or suggest the new added feature of "verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource", Examiner respectfully disagrees. The newly added limitation in the context of the claimed invention is broadly interpreted as verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information in response to a request for

information; this feature is clearly taught in Feuerstein et al., [0033] for verifying the integrity and origin of a resource (i.e., requested information) by security component wherein security component can be interpreted as a recipient of the resource since the security component can access to the resource to formulate/calculate its descriptor/checksum for verifying process (see Feuerstein et al., [0034] and [0100]).

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: the recited “A process” as recited in claim 1, line 1 and claim 8, line 1 should be changed to “A computer implemented process” to clarify the claimed process as process implemented with computers. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-17, 19-23, 25 and 26 (effective filing date 09/16/2003) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call (US Patent No 6,154,738 issued on

11/28/2000) in view of Feuerstein et al. (US Publication No 2002/0083341, publication date 06/27/2002).

As to claim 1, Call teaches:

“A process for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 1, lines 53-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product and used to locate information about the product in a manufacturer’s system (service provider) can be considered as a fixed identifier associated with product and information about the product; product information or a web page or file containing product information can be all considered as Applicant’s “service provider resource”; and the association between the universal product code (ID) and the product information (resource) allows to access resource by using the ID without being affected by changes to the resource (i.e., URL of the resource changed); also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 48-53]), the process comprising the steps of:

“a central server receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a particular resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 10-15 and 30-42] and [column 5, lines 30-45] wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 35-45] is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”);

“extracting a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with an associated service provider resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45] wherein a file containing

product information located by an internet address is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider resource", universal product code identifying a product also used to identify the file containing information about the product is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider resource identifier", and the product code or identifier must be extracted from the request message or query as illustrated in Applicant's claim language to perform a lookup operation as disclosed; also see [column 1, lines 53-60], [column 9, lines 63-65] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

"providing a source information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to service provider resource information, said database containing resource information for all service providers within the central server's area of responsibility, said resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource, said substantive descriptive information comprising a description of the resource" (see [column 2, lines 35-55], [column 4, lines 30-42], [column 5, lines 42-55], [column 6, lines 48-67] and Fig. 2 wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant's "central server", and its relational database including information for all manufacturer systems (service providers) is equivalent to a source information database as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [column 6, lines 55-67] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein URL and other cross referencing information is equivalent to Applicant's "resource information"; also see [column 9, lines 43-45] and [column 12, lines 1-15] for cross-referencing URLs, product code (ISBN number for books) and book

(product) information wherein book information presents the content of product information which is an content description of the product information itself); and

“said central server accessing said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and retrieving service provider resource information comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource and comprising a description of the resource from said database” (see [column 2, lines 35-43], [column 9, lines 17-21] and [column 10, lines 48-60] wherein product description, i.e. book description, describes the product information (resource) of a manufacturer is interpreted as Applicant’s “description of the resource”).

However, Call does not explicitly teach security features including verifying a request for information and verifying requested information as recited as follows:

“wherein said central server verifies said resource information request concerning said service provider resource from said resource requestor before returning the retrieved service provider resource information”; and

“verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource”.

On the other hand, Feuerstein et al. teaches security features including verifying a request for information and verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (see Feuerstein et al., [0011] for verifying a request for information, and see [0012] for verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (i.e., resource); also see [0033], [0045], [0063] and [0082]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Feuerstein et al. into Call's system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Feuerstein et al., [0010]-[0011] to eliminate security risks to the system and to verify the integrity and origin of the requested information. As a result, Call's system with security features of verifying resource information request and verifying the integrity and origin of the resource information would be more secure and reliable.

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said central server’s area of responsibility is locally, assignment or trust based” (see Call, [column 5, lines 42-55] and [column 25, lines 35-50]).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see Call, [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant’s “universal resource identifier”; also see Feuerstein et al., [0045]).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said central server returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see Call, [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-45] and [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein the server implementing the product code translator is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and information including internet addresses and other information concerning the universal product code are equivalent to Applicant’s “the retrieved service provider resource information”).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see Call, [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call teaches:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see Call, [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource description”; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource”).

As to claim 8, Call teaches:

“A process for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 1, lines 53-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product and used to locate information about the product in a manufacturer’s system (service provider) can be considered as a fixed identifier associated with product and information about the product, and product information or a web page or file containing product information can be all considered as Applicant’s “service provider resource”, and the association between the universal product code (ID) and the product information (resource) allows to access resource by using the ID without being affected by changes to the resource (i.e., URL of the resource changed); also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 48-53]), the process comprising the steps of:

“a service provider site receiving a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a service provider resource” (see [column 15, lines 27-55] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “a service provider site”; also see [column 32, lines 37-40]);

“extracting a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with said service provider resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45] wherein a file containing product information located by an internet address is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource”, universal product code identifying a product also used to identify the file containing information about the product is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider resource identifier”, and the product code or identifier must be extracted from the request message or query as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language to perform a lookup operation as disclosed; also see [column 1, lines 53-60], [column 9, lines 63-65] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

“providing a resource information database resident on said service provider site that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to information concerning associated resources of said service provider, said database resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource, said substantive descriptive information comprising a description of the resource” (see [column 15, lines 25-53] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site”, file-based database containing cross-referencing for all product codes to information (i.e. URL) to locate product information is equivalent to a resource information database as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also see [column 9, lines 43-

45] and [column 12, lines 1-15] for cross-referencing URLs, product code (ISBN number for books) and book (product) information wherein book information presents the content of product information which is an content description of the product information itself); and

“said service provider site accessing said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and retrieving associated service provider resource information comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource and comprising a description of the resource from said database” (see [column 2, lines 35-43], [column 9, lines 17-21] and [column 10, lines 48-60] wherein product description, i.e. book description, describes the product information (resource) of a manufacturer is interpreted as Applicant’s “description of the resource”).

However, Call does not explicitly teach security features including verifying a request for information and verifying requested information as recited as follows:

“wherein said service provider side verifies said resource information request concerning said service provider resource from said resource requestor before returning the retrieved resource information”; and

“verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource”.

On the other hand, Feuerstein et al. teaches security features including verifying a request for information and verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (see Feuerstein et al., [0011] for verifying a request for information, and see [0012] for verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (i.e., resource); also see [0033], [0045], [0063] and [0082]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Feuerstein et al. into Call's system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Feuerstein et al., [0010]-[0011] to eliminate security risks to the system and to verify the integrity and origin of the requested information. As a result, Call's system with security features of verifying resource information request and verifying the integrity and origin of the resource information would be more secure and reliable.

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see Call, [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant's “universal resource identifier”; also see Feuerstein et al., [0045]).

As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said server provider site returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see Call, [column 15, lines 27-55] and [column 33, lines 1-5] wherein the Web server is equivalent to Applicant's “service provider site”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant's “resource requestor”, and information including internet

addresses and other cross-referencing information are equivalent to Applicant's "the retrieved service provider resource information").

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

"wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider" (see Call, [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant's "resource requestor").

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

"wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user" (see Call, [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent to Applicant's "resource description"; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant's "resource").

As to claim 14, Call teaches:

“An apparatus for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 1, lines 53-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product and used to locate information about the product in a manufacturer’s system (service provider) can be considered as a fixed identifier associated with product and information about the product, and product information or a web page or file containing product information can be all considered as Applicant’s “service provider resource”, and the association between the universal product code (ID) and the product information (resource) allows to access resource by using the ID without being affected by changes to the resource (i.e., URL of the resource changed); also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 48-53]), the apparatus comprising:

“a request reception module on a central server configured to receive a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a service provider resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 10-15 and 30-42] and [column 5, lines 30-45] wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and the disclose of receiving request or accepting query suggests the inclusion of a request reception module as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“an extraction module configured to extract a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with said service provider resource” (see [column 2, lines 35-45] and

[column 5, lines 30-40] wherein a file containing product information located by an internet address is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider resource", universal product code identifying a product also used to identify the file containing information about the product is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider resource identifier", and the product code or identifier must be extracted from the request message or query by an extraction module as illustrated in Applicant's claim language to perform a lookup operation as disclosed; also see [column 1, lines 53-60] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

"a source information database resident on said central server that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to service provider resource information, said database containing resource information for all service providers within the central server's area of responsibility, said resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource, said substantive descriptive information comprising a description of the resource" (see [column 2, lines 35-55], [column 4, lines 30-42], [column 5, lines 42-55], [column 6, lines 48-67] and Fig. 2 wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant's "central server", and its relational database including information for all manufacturer systems (service providers) is equivalent to a source information database as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [column 6, lines 55-67] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein URL and other cross referencing information is equivalent to Applicant's "resource information"; also see [column 9, lines 43-45] and [column 12, lines 1-15] for cross-referencing URLs, product code (ISBN number for books) and book (product) information

wherein book information presents the content of product information which is an content description of the product information itself); and

“an accessing and retrieval module, configured to access said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and to retrieve associated service provider resource information comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource and comprising a description of the resource from said database” (see [column 2, lines 35-43], [column 9, lines 17-21] and [column 10, lines 48-60] wherein product description, i.e. book description, describes the product information (resource) of a manufacturer is interpreted as Applicant’s “description of the resource”).

However, Call does not explicitly teach security features including verifying a request for information and verifying requested information as recited as follows:

“wherein said central server verifies said resource information request concerning said service provider resource from said resource requestor before returning the retrieved service provider resource information”; and

“a module for verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource”.

On the other hand, Feuerstein et al. teaches security features including verifying a request for information and verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (see Feuerstein et al., [0011] for verifying a request for information, and see [0012] for verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (i.e., resource); also see [0033], [0045], [0063] and [0082]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Feuerstein et al. into Call's system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Feuerstein et al., [0010]-[0011] to eliminate security risks to the system and to verify the integrity and origin of the requested information. As a result, Call's system with security features of verifying resource information request and verifying the integrity and origin of the resource information would be more secure and reliable.

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said central server’s area of responsibility is locally, assignment or trust based” (see Call, [column 5, lines 42-55] and [column 25, lines 35-50]).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see Call, [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant’s “universal resource identifier”).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said central server returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see Call, [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-45] and [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein the server implementing the product code translator is equivalent to Applicant’s “central server”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and information including internet addresses and other information concerning the universal product code are equivalent to Applicant’s “the retrieved service provider resource information”).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see Call, [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see Call, [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource description”; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource”).

As to claim 21, Call teaches:

“An apparatus for using an association between a service provider resource and a fixed identifier to allows resource requestors to consistently access a service provider resource without being affected by changes to the service provider resource” (see [column 1, lines 53-67] wherein universal product code identifying a specific product and used to locate information about the product in a manufacturer’s system (service provider) can be considered as a fixed identifier associated with product and information about the product, and product information or a web page or file containing product information can be all considered as Applicant’s “service provider resource”, and the association between the universal product code (ID) and the product information (resource) allows to access resource by using the ID without being affected by changes to the resource (i.e., URL of the resource changed) also see [column 4, lines 1-15] and [column 15, lines 48-53]), the apparatus comprising:

“a request reception module on a service provider site configured to receive a resource information request from a resource requestor concerning a service provider resource” (see

[column 15, lines 27-55] wherein Web server is equivalent to Applicant's "a service provider site" and the disclosure of processing HTTP message or request implies the receiving that HTTP request and must include a request reception module as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [column 32, lines 37-40];

"an extraction module configured to extract a fixed service provider resource identifier from said resource information request, said service provider resource identifier having a one to one correspondence with said service provider resource" (see [column 15, lines 25-55] wherein ISBN number is equivalent to Applicant's "service provider resource identifier", the disclosure of performing a table lookup operation suggest the extracting and the inclusion of an extraction module as illustrated in Applicant's claim language, and for each ISBN number (identifier) only one URL (resource) is retrieved as disclosed suggests the one to one correspondence as in Applicant's claim language; also see [column 1, lines 53-60] and [column 17, lines 20-25] for a one to one correspondence between an identifier and information resource);

"a resource information database resident on said service provider site that contains cross references from service provider resource identifiers to information concerning associated resources of said service provider, said database resource information for each resource comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource, said substantive descriptive information comprising a description of the resource" (see [column 2, lines 35-55], [column 4, lines 30-42], [column 5, lines 42-55], [column 6, lines 48-67] and Fig. 2 wherein the server computer implementing the product code translator [column 5, lines 40-45] is equivalent to Applicant's "central server", and its relational database including information for all manufacturer systems (service providers) is equivalent to a source

information database as illustrated in Applicant's claim language; also see [column 6, lines 55-67] and [column 33, lines 1-10] wherein URL and other cross referencing information is equivalent to Applicant's "resource information"; also see [column 9, lines 43-45] and [column 12, lines 1-15] for cross-referencing URLs, product code (ISBN number for books) and book (product) information wherein book information presents the content of product information which is an content description of the product information itself); and

"an accessing and retrieval module, configured to access said database using said extracted service provider resource identifier and to retrieve associated service provider resource information comprising at least a universal resource locator (URL) and substantive descriptive information concerning the resource and comprising a description of the resource from said database" (see [column 2, lines 35-43], [column 9, lines 17-21] and [column 10, lines 48-60] wherein product description, i.e. book description, describes the product information (resource) of a manufacturer is interpreted as Applicant's "description of the resource");

However, Call does not explicitly teach security features including verifying a request for information and verifying requested information as recited as follows:

"wherein said service provider site verifies said resource information request concerning said service provider resource from said resource requestor before returning the retrieved service provider resource information"; and

"a module for verifying integrity and origin of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource by a recipient of said substantive descriptive information concerning the resource".

On the other hand, Feuerstein et al., teaches security features including verifying a request for information and verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (see Feuerstein et al., [0011] for verifying a request for information, and see [0012] for verifying the integrity and origin of the requested information (i.e., resource); also see [0033], [0045], [0063] and [0082]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Feuerstein et al. into Call's system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so as suggested by Feuerstein et al., [0010]-[0011] to eliminate security risks to the system and to verify the integrity and origin of the requested information. As a result, Call's system with security features of verifying resource information request and verifying the integrity and origin of the resource information would be more secure and reliable.

As to claim 22, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said service provider resource identifier is a universal resource identifier (URI)” (see Call, [column 21, lines 5-25 and 50-55] wherein domain name is equivalent to Applicant's “universal resource identifier”; also see Feuerstein et al., [0045]).

As to claim 23, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said server provider site returns the retrieved service provider resource information to said resource requestor” (see Call, [column 15, lines 27-55] and [column 33, lines 1-5] wherein the Web server is equivalent to Applicant’s “service provider site”, requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”, and information including internet addresses and other cross-referencing information are equivalent to Applicant’s “the retrieved service provider resource information”).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the URL from the retrieved service provider resource information to access the resource from the service provider” (see Call, [column 2, lines 35-45], [column 4, lines 30-40] and [column 15, lines 47-65] wherein requesting browser is equivalent to Applicant’s “resource requestor”).

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 21 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Call and Feuerstein et al. teach:

“wherein said resource requestor uses the retrieved said service provider resource information to display the resource description to a user” (see Call, [column 23, lines 10-50], [column 25, lines 35-65] and [column 26, lines 1-20] wherein product description is equivalent

Art Unit: 2164

to Applicant's "resource description"; also see [column 9, lines 15-25] wherein information about the manufacturer is a resource description relating to the source of the file containing product information wherein the file containing product information is equivalent to Applicant's "resource").

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571)272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung T Vy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163

Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner
Art Unit 2164
October 21, 2008